EXHIBIT 9

VISCONTI AND BOREN LTD

COUNSELORS-AT-LAW

• Girard R. Visconti
Richard A. Boren
Dante J. Giammarco
• David M. Campbell
• Jessica L. Papazian-Ross
• Lillian M. Lloyd
• Amy E. Stratton
• David L. Fine

Of Counsel
• Gregory P. Cimino, II

• also admitted in MA
• also admitted in MA and NY
• also admitted in CT and DC

February 26, 2008

VIA FACSIMILE ONLY 202-887-0336
Stuart E. Benson, Esq.
Manelli Denison & Selter PLLC
2000 M Street, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036

RE: CONSORZIO DEL PROSCIUTTO DI SAN DANIELE
v.
DANIELE, INC.
C.A. No. 07-039ML

Dear Stuart:

In response to your letter dated February 22, 2008, I have obtained a copy of the label for Deli-Cut-O for bulk prosciutto which is being mailed to you. As for the discovery I objected to on the grounds that it pertains to Counts II and III, you and I simply cannot agree on whether the discovery fits into Count I, Count II or Count III and therefore, I think the court has to make that determination. As I indicated to you, if the court disagrees with our position on Counts II and III, then I will be supplementing the discovery response and many of your questions may be answered at that time. As to Interrogatory No. 2, we stated that Vlado and Stefano have knowledge regarding production at Daniele and therefore there is no further response to provide. As to Interrogatory No. 5, there is nothing further to provide. As to Interrogatory No. 8, there is no further response to provide. As to Request No. 17, the basis for the objection is you asked for all correspondence with purchasers. It was not limited to any topic; thus, any correspondence we had at any time with any purchaser would fit within the realm of Request for Production No. 17. Thus, the request as written is overly broad, burdensome and seeks information that is irrelevant. Generally, once I object to a request and then provide without waiving said objection, I am providing you with the responsive documents. Thus, for Request for Production No. 17, I have provided you with any responsive document from March 25, 2005 to the present. There was nothing further to respond to.

Several of the responses that I think are pertinent to Counts II and III, the response will be "None." However, for reasons already stated, I am not supplementing the responses until the court rules on the motion to stay.

Regarding the documents you attached, our firm bate stamped these three documents which is on the right hand side at the bottom you will see numbers 94, 95, 96 and 97, and those numbers correspond to response to Request for Production No. 16.

Enclosed please find a supplemental response to the Request for

Production which should clarify the documents you received 000334-000438. I again reiterate my request to hold off on filing a motion to compel discovery until the court rules on the motion to stay.

Very truly yours,

Jessica L. Papazian-Ross

JLPR:jfr

Enclosure